

## REMARKS

Claim 1, 14, 25, 35, 41, 50, and 55 have been amended. Claims 1-29, 31-41, 45-51, 55, and 56 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be 5 withdrawn and the application be forwarded on to issuance.

### Interview Summary

Applicant's Representative, Mark Niemann, wishes to thank Examiner Nicholas Augustine for the telephone interview on March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009.

10 During the interview, Applicant's Representative and the Examiner discussed amending the claims to recite that the multiple controls are “simultaneously displayed” in the operating system shell's taskbar. Applicant's Representative understood the Examiner to consider the claims, if amended, to be allowable over the references of record. Accordingly, Applicant amends claims 1, 15 14, 25, 35, 41, 50, and 55 to recite “simultaneously” displaying.

As discussed during the interview, Applicant submits that the Blaze reference does not teach or in any way suggest “simultaneously displaying” multiple controls in the operating system shell's taskbar. Rather, Blaze teaches that a user must click on an icon in the taskbar in order to access further media 20 player functionality. The Office relies on Srinivasan to cure the deficiencies of Blaze. However, as discussed during the interview, the Srinivasan reference does not teach simultaneously displaying multiple controls in the *operating system shell's taskbar*. Srinivasan, rather, discusses that media controls are displayed in the taskbar of an *application*. Displaying media controls in the taskbar of an 25 application, however, is not the same as displaying multiple controls in the operating system shell's taskbar. Srinivasan, therefore, does not cure the deficiencies of Blaze.

Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, and understood that the Examiner considered the claims, as amended, to be allowable.

### **Conclusion**

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,  
5 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

10 Dated: April 15, 2009

By: /Mark F. Niemann/  
Mark F. Niemann  
Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby  
Reg. No. 61,817  
(509) 755-7259